UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/087,368	03/01/2002	Reza Shahidi	4740-109	3404

24112 7590 06/07/2004

COATS & BENNETT, PLLC
P O BOX 5
RALEIGH, NC 27602

EXAMINER	
LELE, TANMAY S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2684	9

DATE MAILED: 06/07/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/087,368	SHAHIDI ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Tanmay S Lele	2684

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 March 2004*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-51* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4,5,7*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see paper number 8, pages 1 – 3, filed 08 March 2004, with respect to the "Restriction Requirement" have been fully considered and are persuasive. The "Restriction Requirement" of paper number 6 has been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 14, it was not understood what quantified a "value [that] is a relatively small fraction." For purposes of examination it was assumed that the value of reduction was less than previously sent. Appropriate correction is required.

4. Claim 42 recites the limitation "wherein maintaining an interval timer" in line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. For purposes of examination is was assumed this claim depended on claim 41 (which would thus provide proper antecedent basis).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-8, 19 –27, 36, 37, 44, 45, 48, and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Salonaho (Salonaho, World Intellectual Property Organization, WO 99/52310).

Regarding claims 1 and 19, Salonaho teaches of a method and system of controlling transmit powers at a plurality of base stations during a soft handoff to reduce power imbalance between base stations (Figure 2), the method comprising: receiving power control commands at the base stations from a mobile station in soft handoff (page 3, lines 14 -16 and page 5, lines 16 - 23); adjusting the transmit powers at the respective base stations responsive to the power control commands from the mobile station by applying power adjustments to current transmit powers of the base stations (page 3, lines 17 -20 and page 5, lines 16 -23); varying a step size of the power adjustments as a function of the current transmit powers and a common reference power (page 3, lines 17 - 20 and page 5, lines 6 - 23); and adjusting the common reference power based on power measurement reports from the mobile station (page 3, lines 14 - 20 and page 5, lines 6 - 23).

Regarding claims 2 and 20, Salonaho teaches all the limitations recited in claims 1 and 19. Salonaho further teaches of wherein varying a step size of the power adjustments as a function of the current transmit powers and a common reference power comprises varying the step size of the power adjustment at each base station based on a difference between the current transmit power of the base station and the common reference power (Figure 6 and page 6, lines 31 - 34 and page 8, lines 16 -34).

Regarding claim 3, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 2. Salonaho further teaches of wherein varying the step size of the power adjustment at each base

station based on a difference between the current transmit power of the base station and the common reference power comprises: increasing the step size if the power control commands from the mobile station move the transmit power of the base station toward the common reference power; and decreasing the step size if the power control commands from the mobile station move the transmit power of the base station away from the common reference power (Figure 6 and page 8,lines 16 -34).

Regarding claims 4 and 23, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claims 3 and 22. Salonaho further teaches of wherein increasing the step size comprises changing the transmit power by an adjustment term formed as a sum of a fixed adjustment term and a variable adjustment term (Figure 6 page 7, lines 31 –37, page 8,. lines 5 –13 and page 8,lines 16 -34).

Regarding claims 5 and 24, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claims 3 and 23. Salonaho further teaches of wherein decreasing the step size comprises changing the transmit power by an adjustment term formed as a difference of a fixed adjustment term and a variable adjustment term (Figure 6, page 7, lines 31 –37, page 8, lines 5 –13 and page 8,lines 16 -34).

Regarding claim 6, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 2. Salonaho further teaches of wherein varying the step size of the power adjustment at each base station based on a difference between the current transmit power of the base station and the common reference power comprises calculating the step size based on a fixed adjustment term dependent on the power control commands from the mobile station and a variable adjustment term proportional to the difference between the current transmit power of the base station and the

common reference power (Figure 6, page 7, lines 31 –37, page 8, lines 5 –13 and page 8,lines 16 -34).

Regarding claim 7, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 6. Salonaho further teaches of wherein calculating the step size comprises: selecting one of a fixed upward adjustment value and a fixed downward adjustment value as the fixed adjustment term based on the power control commands from the mobile station (Figure 6 and page 8, lines 16 - 34); and calculating the variable adjustment term by subtracting the common reference power from the current transmit power of the base station (Figure 6, page 7, lines 31 –37, page 8, lines 5 –13 and page 8,lines 16 -34).

Regarding claim 8, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 7. Salonaho further teaches of wherein calculating the step size further comprises combining the fixed adjustment term with the variable adjustment term. (Figure 6 and starting page 7,line 22 and ending page 8, line 15).

Regarding claim 21, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 20. Salonaho further teaches of wherein the at least one processor in each base station increases the step size of the power adjustment if the power control command from the mobile station would move the transmit power toward the common reference power (Figure 6, page 7, lines 31 –37, page 8, lines 5 –13 and page 8,lines 16 -34).

Regarding claim 22, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 21. Salonaho further teaches of wherein the at least one processor in each base station decreases the step size if the power control command from the mobile station would move the transmit power

away from the common reference power (Figure 6, page 7, lines 31 –37, page 8, lines 5 –13 and page 8,lines 16 -34).

Regarding claim 25, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 24. Salonaho further teaches of wherein the at least one processor in each base station selects one of a fixed upward adjustment value and a fixed downward adjustment value as the fixed adjustment term based on the power control command from the mobile station (Figure 6, page 7, lines 31 – 37, page 8, lines 5 –13 and page 8,lines 16 -34).

Regarding claim 26, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 24. Salonaho further teaches of wherein the at least one processor in each base station calculates the variable adjustment term as the difference between the common reference power and the current transmit power (Figure 6, page 7, lines 31 –37, page 8, lines 5 –13 and page 8,lines 16 -34).

Regarding claim 27, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 26. Salonaho further teaches of wherein the at least one processor in each base station calculates the difference between the common reference power and the current transmit power by subtracting the common reference power from the current transmit power (Figure 6, page 7, lines 31 –37, page 8, lines 5 –13 and page 8,lines 16 -34).

Regarding claims 36, 44, and 48 Salonaho teaches of a method, controller and processor for controlling a common reference power used by a plurality of base stations during a soft handoff to vary step size of forward link transmit power adjustments (Figure 2 and 6), said method comprising: receiving power measurement reports from a mobile station in soft handoff (page 3, lines 14 -16 and page 5, lines 16 -23); and adjusting the common reference power

responsive to the power measurement reports from the mobile station (page 3, lines 14 - 20 and page 5, lines 6 -23).

Regarding claims 37, 45 and 49, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 36, 44, and 48. Salonaho further teaches of wherein adjusting the common reference power comprises increasing the common reference power responsive to the receipt of a power measurement report from the mobile station (Figure 6, page 7, lines 31 –37, page 8, lines 5 –13 and page 8,lines 16 -34).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 9, 10, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salonaho (Salonaho, World Intellectual Property Organization, WO 99/52310) as applied to claims 7 and 27 above, and further in view of Hambe et al. (Hambe, US Patent No. 6,351,651).

Regarding claim 9, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 7. Salonaho does not teach of wherein calculating the variable adjustment term by subtracting the common reference power from the current transmit power of the base station further comprises multiplying the variable adjustment term by a convergence coefficient.

In a related art dealing with power control, Hambe teaches of wherein calculating the variable adjustment term by subtracting the common reference power from the current transmit

power of the base station further comprises multiplying the variable adjustment term by a convergence coefficient (starting column 7, line 55 and ending column 8, line 2).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Salonaho's power control system, Hambe's coefficient, for the purposes of accurately controlling power to obtain higher capacity on both links, as taught by Hambe.

Regarding claim 10, Salonaho in view of Hambe teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 9. Hambe further teaches of further comprising setting a magnitude of the convergence coefficient to set a sensitivity of the power adjustment to the difference between the current transmit power of the base station and the common reference power (column 8, lines 3 – 13).

Regarding claim 28, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 27. Salonaho does not specifically teach of wherein the at least one processor in each base station further calculates the variable adjustment term based on scaling the variable adjustment term by a convergence coefficient to set a sensitivity of step size adjustment to the difference between the common reference power and the current transmit power.

In a related art dealing with power control, Hambe teaches of wherein the at least one processor in each base station further calculates the variable adjustment term based on scaling the variable adjustment term by a convergence coefficient to set a sensitivity of step size adjustment to the difference between the common reference power and the current transmit power (starting column 7, line 55 and ending column 8, line 2 and column 8, lines 3 –13).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Salonaho's power control system, Hambe's coefficient, for the purposes of accurately controlling power to obtain higher capacity on both links, as taught by Hambe.

9. Claims 11 – 16, 29 –32, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salonaho (Salonaho, World Intellectual Property Organization, WO 99/52310) as applied to claims1 and 19 above, and further in view of Chen (Chen, US Patent No, 5,893,035).

Regarding claim 11, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 1. Salonaho does not specifically teach of wherein adjusting the common reference power based on the power measurement reports comprises adjusting the common reference power responsive to reported frame errors at the mobile station as indicated by the power measurement reports.

In a related art dealing with power control, Chen teaches of wherein adjusting the common reference power based on the power measurement reports comprises adjusting the common reference power responsive to reported frame errors at the mobile station as indicated by the power measurement reports (column 2,lines 50-63).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Salonaho's power control system, Chen's error reporting techniques, for the purpose of reducing delay while retaining a measure of quality of communication, as taught by Chen.

Regarding claim 12, Salonaho in view of Chen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 11. Chen further teaches of wherein adjusting the common reference power based on reported frame errors at the mobile station further comprises: receiving an error report from the mobile station at a base station controller communicatively coupled to the base stations (starting

column 2, line 61 and ending column 3, line 5); and signaling the base stations such that the common reference power is adjusted upward by a predetermined increment value (starting column 2, line 61 and ending column 3, line 5).

Regarding claim 13, Salonaho in view of Chen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 12. Chen further teaches of wherein adjusting the common reference power based on reported frame errors at the mobile station further comprises signaling the base stations such that the common reference power is adjusted downward by a predetermined decrement value if no error report is received from the mobile station within a defined period (column 9, lines 7 –15).

Regarding claim 14, Salonaho in view of Chen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 13. Chen further teaches of wherein the predetermined decrement value is a relatively small fraction of the predetermined increment value (column 9, lines 7 –15).

Regarding claim 15, Salonaho in view of Chen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 13. Chen further teaches of wherein the defined period defines an adjustment rate for the common reference power that is slower than a rate at which the power control commands are received from the mobile station at the base stations (column 11, lines 26 –36 and Table 1).

Regarding claim 16, Salonaho in view of Chen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 13. Chen further teaches of wherein the adjustment rate is a frame rate of forward link data frames defined for forward link signaling between the base stations and the mobile station (column 11, lines 26 –36 and Table 1).

Regarding claim 29, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitation as recited in claim 19. Salonaho does not specifically teach of wherein the at least one processor in the base station controller adjusts the common reference power based on reported errors at the mobile station by:

receiving an error report from the mobile station; and signaling the base stations such that the common reference power is adjusted upward by a predetermined increment value.

In a related art dealing with power control, Chen teaches of wherein the at least one processor in the base station controller adjusts the common reference power based on reported errors at the mobile station by: receiving an error report from the mobile station (starting column 2, line 61 and ending column 3, line 5); and signaling the base stations such that the common reference power is adjusted upward by a predetermined increment value (starting column 2, line 61 and ending column 3, line 5).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Salonaho's power control system, Chen's error reporting techniques, for the purpose of reducing delay while retaining a measure of quality of communication, as taught by Chen.

Regarding claim 30, Salonaho in view of Chen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 29. Chen further teaches of wherein the at least one processor in the base station controller further adjusts the common reference power by signaling the base stations such that the common reference power is adjusted downward by a predetermined decrement value if no error report is received from the mobile station within a defined reporting period (column 9, lines 7 –15).

Regarding claim 31, Salonaho in view of Chen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 30. Chen further teaches of wherein the defined reporting period defines an adjustment rate that is slower than a rate at which the power control commands are received from the mobile station at the base stations (column 11, lines 26 –36 and Table 1).

Regarding claim 32, Salonaho in view of Chen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 31. Chen further teaches of wherein the adjustment rate is a frame rate of forward link data frames defined for forward link signaling between the base stations and the mobile station (column 11, lines 26 –36 and Table 1).

Regarding claim 34, Salonaho in view of Chen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 32. Salonaho and Chen further teach of wherein the at least one processor in the base station controller maintains a frame timer for timing adjustments to the common reference power (Salonaho: page 3, lines 18 –20 and Chen: column 8, lines 46 –55).

10. Claims 17 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salonaho (Salonaho, World Intellectual Property Organization, WO 99/52310) and Chen (Chen, US Patent No, 5,893,035) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Chen (Chen, US Patent No. 5,982,760).

Regarding claims 17 and 33, Salonaho in view of Chen teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claims 16 and 32. Salonaho in view of Chen do not specifically teach of wherein the power control commands from the mobile station are received at the base stations at sixteen times the frame rate (though it should be noted that power control commands are commonly known in the art to be sent in every frame, and further that a traffic channels are 20 ms in length with a command sent every 1.25 ms or 16 times as per IS-95 specification).

In a related art dealing with power control systems, Chen teaches of wherein the power control commands from the mobile station are received at the base stations at sixteen times the frame rate (starting column 12, line 67 and ending column 13, line 1).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Salonaho and Chen's power control system, Chen's framing structure, for the purposes of combating fading and excessive power (and thus interference) by controlling power reliably, as taught by Chen.

11. Claims 18, 35, 43, and 51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salonaho (Salonaho, World Intellectual Property Organization, WO 99/52310) as applied to claims 1, 19, 36, and 48 above, and further in view of Ziv et al. (Ziv, US Patent No. 5,884,187).

Regarding claims 18, 35, 43, and 51, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claims 1, 19, 36, and 48. Salonaho does not specifically teach of wherein the power measurement report from the mobile station includes the number of error frames since the last power measurement report.

In a related art dealing with power control, Ziv teaches of wherein the power measurement report from the mobile station includes the number of error frames since the last power measurement report (column 14, lines 43 –59).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Salonaho's power control system, Ziv's error reporting means, for the purposes of controlling power with respect to the quality of signal received, as taught by Ziv.

12. Claims 38 – 40, 46, and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salonaho (Salonaho, World Intellectual Property Organization, WO 99/52310) as applied to claim 37 above, and further in view of Tripathi (Tripathi, US Patent No. 6,587,442).

Regarding claim 38, 46, and 50 Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited

claims 37, 45, and 49. Salonaho does not specifically teach of decreasing the common reference power if no power measurement report is received within a predetermined time period.

In a related art dealing with power control, Tripathi teaches of decreasing the common reference power if no power measurement report is received within a predetermined time period (column 5, lines 49 –54).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Salonaho's power control system Tripathi's variable step power control system, for the purposes of incorporating a power control system that can mitigate long temporal fades, as taught by Tripathi.

Regarding claim 39, Salonaho in view of Tripathi teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 38. Tripathi further teaches of wherein decreasing the common reference power comprises decrementing the common reference power by a defined downward amount (column 5, lines 40 –47 and column 7, lines 35 –48).

Regarding claim 40, Salonaho in view of Tripathi teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 39. Tripathi further teaches of wherein increasing the common reference power comprises incrementing the common reference power by a defined upward amount, and wherein the defined downward amount is a fraction of the defined upward amount (column 5, lines 40 – 47 and column 7, lines 35 –48).

13. Claims 41 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salonaho (Salonaho, World Intellectual Property Organization, WO 99/52310) as applied to claim 36 above, and further in view of Ziv et al. (Ziv, US Patent No. 5,884,187) and Tripathi (Tripathi, US Patent No. 6,587,442).

Regarding claim 41, Salonaho teaches all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 36. Salonaho does not specifically teach of wherein adjusting the common reference power comprises: maintaining an interval timer for timing an update interval; determining whether a power measurement report is received within the update interval; and incrementing the common reference power if a power measurement report was received during the interval, and decrementing the common reference power if a power measurement report was not received during the interval.

In a related art dealing with power control, Ziv teaches of maintaining an interval timer for timing an update interval (column 14, lines 43 –59).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Salonaho's power control system, Ziv's error reporting means, for the purposes of controlling power with respect to the quality of signal received, as taught by Ziv.

Salonaho in view Ziv do not specifically teach of determining whether a power measurement report is received within the update interval; and incrementing the common reference power if a power measurement report was received during the interval, and decrementing the common reference power if a power measurement report was not received during the interval.

In a related art dealing with power control, Tripathi teaches of determining whether a power measurement report is received within the update interval (column 5, lines 49 –54); and incrementing the common reference power if a power measurement report was received during the interval, and decrementing the common reference power if a power measurement report was not received during the interval (column 5, lines 49 –54).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Salonaho and Ziv's power control system Tripathi's variable step power control system, for the purposes of incorporating a power control system that can mitigate long temporal fades, as taught by Tripathi.

Regarding claim 42, Salonaho in view of Ziv and Tripathi, teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 41. Ziv further teaches of wherein maintaining an interval timer comprises maintaining a communication frame timer at a base station controller controlling adjustments of the common reference power (column 14, lines 43 –59).

14. Claim 47 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Salonaho (Salonaho, World Intellectual Property Organization, WO 99/52310) and Tripathi (Tripathi, US Patent No. 6,587,442) as applied to claim 46 above, and further in view of Ziv et al. (Ziv, US Patent No. 5,884,187).

Regarding claim 47, Salonaho and Tripathi teach all the claimed limitations as recited in claim 46. Salonaho and Tripathi do not specifically teach of wherein the power measurement report from the mobile station includes the number of error frames since the last power measurement report.

In a related art dealing with power control, Ziv teaches of wherein the power measurement report from the mobile station includes the number of error frames since the last power measurement report (column 14, lines 43 –59).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to have included into Salonaho and Tripathi's power control system, Ziv's error reporting means, for the purposes of controlling power with respect to the quality of signal received, as taught by Ziv.

Citation of Pertinent Prior Art

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Inventor	Publication	Number	Disclosure
Kim et al.	US Patent	6,418,322	Method for forward power control in cellular system
Chen et al.	US Patent	6,512,925	Method and apparatus for controlling transmission power while in soft handoff
Love et al.	US Patent	5,771,461	Method and apparatus for power control of a first channel based on a signal quality of a second channel

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanmay S Lele whose telephone number is (703) 305-3462. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 - 6:30 PM Monday – Thursdays and on alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A. Maung can be reached on (703) 308-7745. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Tanmay S Lele
Examiner
Art Unit 2684

NICK CORS...
PATENT EXAMINER

tsl
May 28, 2004